DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 095 CS 502 242

AUTHOR Berryman, Cynthia L.; Wilcox, James R.
TITLE A Multivariate Investigation of Perceptual Attributions Concerning Gender Appropriateness in Language.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Communication, Language, and Sex (Bowling Green, Ohio, May 20-21, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attribution Theory; Behavioral Science Research; College Students; Communication Skills; *Credibility; Females; Higher Education; Language Role; *Language Styles; *Language Variation; Males; *Perception; *Personality; Personality Assessment; *Sex Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

To determine the source of perceptual attributions made about male and female communicators, 120 college students provided their perceptions about the speakers on tape recordings in which male/female voices showed variations in task and socio-emotional behavior, pronunciation of "-ing" word endings, interruptions, amount of words, pitch, and intonation. On one tape the speakers used gender-appropriate language, while on the other tape the speakers used gender-inappropriate language. The results indicate that regardless of whether the communicators are male or female, "female" language features consistently contribute to the communicator's credibility, while "male" language features contribute to the communicator's perceived level of extroversion. This evidence shows that communicators are differentially perceived as a consequence of linguistic features in their messages rather than as a consequence of mere identification of source gender, and that one's language should not be restricted by traditional sex-role prescriptions, but should be guided by situational appropriateness. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161095

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A MULTIVARIATE INVESTIGATION OF PERCEPTUAL ATTRIBUTIONS CONCERNING GENDER APPROPRIATENESS IN LANGUAGE

by

Cynthia L. Berryman

and

James R. Wilcox

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cynthia L. Berryman
James R. Wilcox

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Cynthia L. Berryman (Ph.D 1978, Bowling Green State University) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication, Speech, and Theater, University of Cincinnati, Ohio.

James R. Wilcox (Ph.D 1973, Purdue University) is an Associate Professor in the School of Speech Communication, Bowling Green State University, Ohio.

Note: This manuscript is based on a doctoral dissertation completed by Cynthia L. Berryman, June 1978, under the direction of James R. Wilcox.

CS502242

CN001064

A MULTIVARIATE INVESTIGATION OF PERCEPTUAL ATTRIBUTIONS CONCERNING GENDER APPROPRIATENESS IN LANGUAGE

There exists a body of literature reporting stereotypical and/or actual differences in the linguistic behavior of males and females. This research on sex-based language distinctions is characterized by some unsupported, some tentative, and some empirically validated conclusions. Despite the fact that very few actual differences in the speech of males and females are empirically documented, there is a persistence of stereotypical assumptions, perceptions, and expectations concerning the linguistic behavior of the sexes. Linguistic stereotypes assume certain linguistic features as appropriate for one gender or the other. These stereotypes, whether they do or do not correspond to actual behavior, deserve investigation because of their possible prescriptive power on actual sex-role related speech behavior. Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz believe that existing sex-role standards exert real pressure upon individuals to behave in prescribed ways.[1] Rubble and Higgins claim that sex-role norms and stereotypes are so pervasive in our culture that we are disposed throughout our everyday interactions to behave in sex-appropriate ways.[2] Because of the possible prescriptive power of stereotypes, beliefs about sex-related language may be as important as the actual sex-based language differences.

This study investigates both the stereotype of sex-based linguistic distinctions and the state of research on actual sex differences in language and attempts to determine perceptual attributions to male and female communicators who use alleged gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate language.

Sex-based linguistic stereotype

An early portrayal of the linguistic stereotype is supplied by Jespersen who cites women's supposed preference for refined, euphemistic, and hyperbolic

expressions and men's alleged greater use of slang and innovations.[3] Kramer notes that current stereotypes and beliefs characterize women's speech as weaker and less effective than the speech of men. She claims that the female style is supposed to be "emotional, vague, euphemistic, sweetly proper, mindless, endless, high-pitched, and silly."[4] Kramer reports that subjects attribute the following traits to males in their speaking behavior:

> demanding voice, deep voice, boastful, use swear words, dominating, show anger, straight to the point, militant, use slang, authoritarian, forceful, aggressive, blunt, and sense of humor

The traits attributed to females' speaking behavior include:

> enunciate clearly, high pitch, use hands and face to express ideas, gossip, concern for the listener, gentle, fast, talk a lot, emotional, detailed, smooth, open, self-revealing, enthusiastic, good grammar, polite speech, and jibberish 5

With an impression of the stereotype of sex-based linguistic behavior, we can examine the research findings on actual sex differences in language to see the amount of correspondence between the stereotype and actual behavior.

Sex-based linguistic distinctions

The growing literature on sex-based linguistic distinctions suggests that the sexes vary in topics of discourse, that females are more socially-oriented or expressive while males are more task-oriented or instrumental when communicating, that females are more likely than males to use correct linguistic forms, and that females use more questions than males use. Female speech may be characterized by politeness and uncertainty. It has been suggested that females use more intensifying adjectives and adverbs while males use more slang terms. Many studies propose a sex difference in amount of discourse. Additionally, sex differences are posited in the area of paralinguistic characteristics, including supposed differential use of pitch

and intonation. Examination of this research shows many of these conclusions to be unsupported or tentative, at best. Empirically documented sex-typical language distinctions are limited in number.

Some research has indicated that males and females are likely to discourse about different topics, with females discussing family and domestic issues, other people, and interpersonal concerns and males discussing more "worldly" matters of business, money, or politics.[6] Much of this literature, however, is dated or presents generalized opinions with no empirical support. As areas of political, educational, social, economic, and occupational disparity between the sexes lessen, statements regarding sex-based topics of discourse may no longer be applicable.

Researchers have shown that the communication of females serves a socio-emotional or expressive function while the communication of males fulfills a task or instrumental role.[7] Baird's review of sex differences in group communication concludes that studies consistently have corroborated this distinction.[8]

Empirical investigations consistently have shown that females are more likely than males to use linguistic forms characterized by correctness.[9] Thorne and Henley conclude, from their review of sex differences in language, that correctness of female speech is the best documented of all the alleged linguistic differences between the sexes.[10]

Another area of supposed distinctions involves the use of questions. Although there is literature to suggest that the sexes' language varies in frequency of questions, research on this issue presents inconsistent findings. Fishman, Hirschman, and Soskin and John report females asking more questions than males.[11] Bernard and Lakoff assert that females more frequently use tag-questions,[12] while DuBois and Crouch present empirical evidence of tag-questions in male but not in female speech.[13] The sexes' differential use of

questions, specifically the tag-question, is, as yet, a tentative conclusion.

Various researchers suggest the existence of certain features in women's speech which create an appearance of politeness and uncertainty. These alleged distinctions include the use of tag-questions as appeasing gestures,[14] requests rather than commands,[15] intonation patterns that convey uncertainty,[16] communication that indicates compliance and passive acceptance,[17] and a lack of interruptions.[18] Many of these statements fall into the realm of speculation and probably indicate more about the linguistic stereotype than they do about actual linguistic distinctions. It has already been concluded that there is insufficient evidence of tag-questions in female speech. There is no empirical evidence in support of females' intonation patterns conveying uncertainty. Further, Hirschman presents contradictory findings regarding the politeness and uncertainty of female speech. She reports the linguistic qualifier "I think", which she defines as a polite way of stating an opinion, occuring twice as frequently in male speech than in female speech.[19] We must conclude that female speech is not necessarily characterized by politeness and uncertainty.

Concerning the sexes interruption behavior, three authors report males more frequently interrupting females.[20] Perhaps this variable functions to produce perceptions of politeness and uncertainty in female speech.

A number of sources indicate that the sexes may vary in their use of adjectives and adverbs,[21] exclamations,[22] verbs,[23] and slang terms.[24] This literature on the possible differential use of semantic items seems sporadic and fragmented. Assumptions seem to outweigh empirical documentation and contradictory research findings exist. For example, Kramer reports no sex difference in the use of "-ly" adverbs or prenominal adjectives.[25] Conclusions about the sex-typical use of semantic items must await the confirmation of considerably more research.

The relative talkativeness of the sexes has been subject to much investigation. Two studies find no sex difference in amount of discourse.[26] Three studies report females as the more talkative sex.[27] Ten studies find males to be more talkative.[28] Of the ten studies reporting males to generate a greater volume of discourse, nine present empirical results. Of these nine, some used married couples as subjects, some involved problem-solving interaction, and others elicited spontaneous speech from a visual stimulus. Thus, from this research under various conditions and using different subject populations, we can conclude that males typically produce a greater amount of speech.

The final area of reported sex-based linguistic differences is in paralanguage--voice pitch and intonation. Research has established that females typically have a higher-pitched voice and males a lower-pitched voice due to both anatomical and cultural factors.[29] Intonation, which seems to be an imitative process,[30] is alleged to be differentially employed by the sexes. Females' intonation patterns seem to be characterized by more variability or expressiveness while males seem to use a more monotonic intonation.[31] It is fairly well established, then, that female voices are typically higher-pitched and more intonationally expressive than male voices.

Comparing the stereotypical view of the speech of males and females with empirically-documented conclusions on sex-typical language shows that perceived differences exceed actual differences. That the linguistic stereotype exceeds empirically-documented differences is evidenced by the limited number of conclusions that can be drawn from sex-typical language research. According to these authors, the documented conclusions of sex-based language include:

1. Males more often assume a task or instrumental role and females a socio-emotional or expressive role when communicating

2. Female speech is more likely than male speech to be characterized by correctness, especially in terms of pronunciation of the -ing suffix.
3. In mixed-sex dyadic interaction, males engage in more interruption than do females
4. Males are more likely than females to generate a greater volume of discourse
5. The pitch of the female voice is higher than the pitch of the male voice
6. Females' intonation patterns are characterized by more variability or expressiveness than males' intonation patterns

Despite the fact that few sex differences in language are empirically validated and many have been proven to have little or no basis in fact, there is the existence of consistent, persistent, and widely-held stereotypes of the sexes linguistic behavior. We must question, then, the basis from which such linguistic stereotypes are formed. Perhaps, the presence of a few distinctions in the speech of males and females may cause those rendering perceptions to attribute more differences to the message than are actually present in the message. This explanation is consistent with the very phenomenon of stereotyping, which implies selective perception and attribution by categorization.

A second, less obvious, explanation, however, for stereotypical generalizations concerning male and female language lies in the area of cultural stereotype. If stereotypical beliefs about the psychology and behavior of the sexes exist, as various researchers indicate,[32] then perceptions of the language of the sexes may be shaped to be consistent with generalized sex-role images. If females are thought to <u>be</u> emotional, indecisive, submissive, supportive, and interpersonally oriented, for example, then it is

natural that their speech is rated likewise. If males are seen as behaving aggressively, instrumentally, objectively, bluntly, and decisively, for example, then their speech probably will be rated in a way that is consistent with that sex-role image.

When source gender is identified, it becomes difficult to separate perceptions of the source based on actual communication behaviors from perceptions that accrue from stereotypical expectations. That is, people may perceive the speech of males and females based on their knowledge of the speaker's gender and the stereotypical assumptions that accompany identification of source gender. To determine the source of perceptual attributions to male and female communicators, this study asks the effect on subjects' ratings of an identified female speaker who uses characteristics of "male" language and vice versa. By comparing subjects' perceptions of male and female speakers in gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate linguistic situations, it is possible to determine whether perceptions are based on mere identification of source gender or on linguistic manipulations in the message. For example, if perceptions of a female speaker who uses gender-appropriate language are the same as perceptions of the same female speaker who uses gender-inappropriate language, then it would seem that listeners are basing their perceptions on mere identification of gender and their attributions would be resulting from stereotypical assumptions of how a female communicates. If, however, the female speaker when using gender-appropriate language is differentially perceived from when she uses gender-inappropriate language, then we can attribute such differential perceptions to specific sex-based language manipulations.

Four research questions are investigated by this study:

1. Will the speech of a male using gender-appropriate language be differentially perceived from the speech of a female using gender-appropriate language?

2. Will the speech of a male using gender-inappropriate language be differentially perceived from the speech of a female using gender-inappropriate language?
3. Will the speech of a male using gender-appropriate language be differentially perceived from the speech of a male using gender-inappropriate language?
4. Will the speech of a female using gender-appropriate language be differentially perceived from the speech of a female using gender-inappropriate language?

Method

To investigate the research questions, a two-randomized-groups design was employed, incorporating one factor (sex-based language) with two levels (gender-appropriate language and gender-inappropriate language).

Independent Variable

Two stimulus tapes were created to establish two levels of the language variable. The first tape, designed to represent the gender-appropriate language condition, consisted of an identified female speaker using "female" language features in conversation with an identified male speaker using "male" language features. Specifically, the communication of the female included twenty instances of socio-emotional behavior, twelve correct pronunciations of -ing word endings, no interruptions, and was 290 words in length. Pitch and intonation were manipulated to be high and expressive, respectively. The communication of the male included twenty-one instances of task behavior, twenty-eight incorrect pronunciations of -ing word endings, four interruptions, and was 582 words long. Pitch and intonation were manipulated to be low and nonexpressive, respectively.

The text for the second stimulus tape (gender-inappropriate language) was identical to tape one, but the male and female speakers reversed script parts. That is, the male exhibited "female" language characteristics and the female incorporated "male" language manipulations.

One-hundred and twenty undergraduate students enrolled in speech courses at Bowling Green State University participated in a pilot study to validate the stimulus tapes. Sixty S's heard the gender-appropriate language tape and rated either the male or the female speaker. Sixty S's heard the gender-inappropriate language tape and rated one or the other of the speakers. S's rated a speaker on seven semantic differential items: very task oriented/not at all task oriented; very socio-emotionally oriented/not at all socio-emotionally oriented; often pronounces -ing word endings/rarely pronounces -ing word endings; often interrupts/rarely interrupts; very talkative/not at all talkative; high-pitch voice/low pitch voice; and very expressive voice/not at all expressive voice.

The data were submitted to discriminant analysis to determine which of the seven semantic differential items maximally differentiated ratings of the speakers within each condition. Results indicate that, in the gender-appropriate language condition, the male speaker was rated significantly differently from the female speaker ($F=24.4$; d. f. = 7, 52; $p < .0001$). Examination of the cell means for each speaker indicates that on six of the seven semantic differential items, S's rated each speaker in the direction of intended experimental manipulations (See Table 1). This tape was judged sufficiently valid to be used in the main experiment.

Insert Table 1 about here

In the gender-inappropriate language condition, the male speaker was rated significantly differently from the female speaker (F=85.4; d. f.=7, 52; $p < .0001$). Examination of the cell means for each speaker indicates that on all seven semantic differential items, S's rated the speaker in the direction of intended experimental manipulations (See Table 2). Thus, this tape was judged valid and used in the main experiment.

Insert Table 2 about here

Dependent Variables

A scale to measure S's perceptions of male and female gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate language was created through factor analytic procedures by these authors. Nine factors which seemed theoretically relevant to sex-typical language were generated. These included the dimensions of credibility, task orientation, socio-emotional orientation, extroversion, status, magnitude, confidence, activity, and aesthetics. Roget's Thesaurus[33] served to generate semantic differential items for each of these nine factors.

One-hundred and fifty-nine undergraduate students enrolled in speech courses at Bowling Green State University served in a pilot study to develop the measuring instrument. Each S heard one or the other of the tapes and rated either the male or the female speaker. Factor analysis (principal factors with communality estimates by the method of squared multiple correlations) with orthogonal rotation to simple structure was performed to determine the dimensionality of the dependent measure. An eigenvalue of 1.0 was set for termination of factor extraction. For a factor to be considered meaningful, it was required to have a minimum of three variables loading on it. Theoretical common sense was used to determine the relative

magnitudes of variable loadings necessary to define a factor. Since no standardized criteria exist for determining whether a variable loading is pure or complex, these researchers made decisions which seemed most relevant given the nature of this study. Such decision-making criteria are suggested by Tucker and Chase.[34]

The factor analysis resulted in the extraction and interpretation of four factors. Factor I was labeled a credibility dimension in accordance with the loadings of twenty scale items: unreasonable/reasonable; logical/illogical; unsound/sound; incorrect/correct; disorganized/organized; uncontrolled/controlled; meaningful/meaningless; high class/low class; precise/imprecise; disoriented/oriented; practical/impractical; confused/orderly; responsible/irresponsible; unstructured/structured; inappropriate/appropriate; relevant/irrelevant; right/wrong; exact/inexact; responsive/unresponsive; and pure/impure. Factor II was interpreted as an extroversion dimension according to the loadings of fifteen scale items: extroverted/introverted; bashful/bold; aggressive/nonaggressive; retiring/forward; follower/leader; assertive/nonassertive; passive/active; outgoing/shy; unsure/sure; superior/subordinate; soft/loud; independent/dependent; idle/busy; persuasive/unpersuasive; and small/large. Factor III was labeled activity as defined by the loadings of four scale items: dynamic/static; subdued/lively; alive/dead; and emotional/nonemotional. Factor IV, confidence, was defined by the loadings of four scale items: ill at ease/at ease; relaxed/tense; nervous/calm; and loose/tight. See Table 3 for the dependent measure factor loadings.

Insert Table 3 about here

Theta reliability[35] was computed for each of the four factors. The theta reliability coefficients were .97 for the credibility factor, .92 for the extroversion factor, .61 for the activity factor, and .45 for the confidence factor.

Main Experiment

One-hundred and sixty-one undergraduate students enrolled in speech courses at Bowling Green State University served as S's in the main experiment. Seventy-five S's heard the gender-appropriate language tape and rated either the male or the female speaker while eighty-six S's heard the gender-inappropriate language tape and rated one or the other of the speakers.

Composite scores on each of the four factors were computed by summing the salient variables for each factor. Four factor scores per subject were then input into discriminant analysis. Four separate discriminant analyses were performed according to the Finn Multivariance program[36] to test the research questions.

Results

Comparison 1: Appropriate male language versus appropriate female language

Results indicate that, in the gender-appropriate language condition, the male speaker was perceived significantly differently from the female speaker ($F=26.7$; d. f.=4, 70; $p<.0001$). Examination of the cell means on the four factors, as presented in Table 4, shows that the male speaker using gender-appropriate language is rated as more extroverted, but less credible, less confident, and slightly less active than the female speaker using gender-appropriate language. The female speaker is seen as more credible, more confident, slightly more active, but less extroverted than the male.

Insert Table 4 about here

Comparison 2: Inappropriate male language versus inappropriate female language

In the gender-inappropriate language condition, the male speaker was perceived significantly differently from the female speaker (F=57.6; d. f.=4, 81; $p<.0001$). The cell means, as presented in Table 5, show that the male speaker using gender-inappropriate language is rated as more credible, but less extroverted, less active, and less confident than the female speaker using gender-inappropriate language. The female is rated as less credible, but more extroverted, active, and confident than the male.

Insert Table 5 about here

Comparison 3: Appropriate male language versus inappropriate male language

The data indicate that the male speaker using gender-appropriate language was perceived significantly differently from the same male speaker using gender-inappropriate language (F=26.4; d. f.=4, 74; $p<.0001$). Comparison of the cell means, as presented in Table 6, shows that the male is rated as more extroverted but less credible and less active when he uses gender-appropriate language. When using gender-inappropriate language, he is perceived as less extroverted but more credible and more active. Nearly identical means on the confidence factor preclude a statement of directional difference.

Insert Table 6 about here

Comparison 4: Appropriate female language versus inappropriate female language

The female speaker in the gender-appropriate language condition was perceived significantly differently from the same female speaker in the gender-inappropriate language condition ($F=57.2$; d. f.=4, 77; $p<.0001$). The cell means, as presented in Table 7, show that the female speaker is rated as more credible, but less extroverted and less confident when she uses gender-appropriate language. When using gender-inappropriate language, she is perceived as less credible, but more extroverted and more confident. Nearly identical means on the activity factor preclude a statement of directional difference.

Insert Table 7 about here

Discussion

Examination of the speakers' ratings on the four factors of credibility, extroversion, activity, and confidence shows some consistent trends. On the credibility dimension, the female speaker, when she uses gender-appropriate language, is viewed as more credible. Conversely, the male speaker is rated as more credible when he uses gender-inappropriate language Given that, in the gender-appropriate language condition, the female speaker is using "female" language distinctions, and in the gender-inappropriate language condition, the male is also using "female" language distinctions, it is clear that "female" language distinctions consistently contribute to the speaker's credibility. It would seem that correct pronunciation of -ing word endings and a lack of interruptions might contribute to the credibility rating.

The fact that "female" language apart from source gender contributes to the user's credibility raises questions about past credibility research. Previous credibility research overwhelmingly indicates that males are viewed as more credible than females.[37] Given the pervasiveness of sex-role stereotypes, it is possible that those rendering perceptions of males and females in past studies may have been influenced by stereotypical expectation, thus, precluding a judgment based mainly on message-related features. Subjects' mere knowledge of source gender in previous credibility research may have led to perceptions based on the stereotypical assumptions accompanying gender. This question has been raised by Housel and McDermott who suggest that credibility may be determined by a combination of language usage and gender of source.[38] It should be noted also that credibility research has focused on the public-communication context, while this study examined perceptions of communicators in dyadic interaction. Perhaps the dimensions of credibility and the credibility ratings of males and females differ in a dyadic communication context.

On the extroversion factor, the male speaker, when using gender-appropriate language, is rated as more extroverted. Conversely, the female speaker is perceived as more extroverted when she uses gender-inappropriate language. That the male in the gender-appropriate language condition is using "male" language features and the female in the gender-inappropriate language condition is also using "male" language indicates that whether they are used by a male or female, "male" language features lead to a perception of extroversion. It would seem that the use of a greater number of words and interruptions could have contributed to the extroversion rating.

The fact that the user of "male" language was perceived as more extroverted, i.e., bold, forward, aggressive, assertive, more of a leader, active,

sure, outgoing, superior, loud, independent, busy, persuasive, and large corroborates the male sex-role image presented in previous sex-role stereotype literature.[30] This finding sheds some light on the source of the cultural stereotype which defines males as more extroverted. Perhaps men are perceived as extroverted because they use language which is associated with extroversion. That is, mere knowledge of source gender and the sex-role related generalizations which accompany gender identification may not be the sole basis for stereotypical generalizations. Rather, perceptions of a male or female communicator may be based on specific features in the communicator's message. Such was the case in this study where the male and female was, in turn, perceived as more extroverted depending on the type of language used.

Ratings on the activity and confidence factors produced little difference in cell means and some inconsistent findings. The slight directional differences suggest that "female" language apart from source gender is associated with activity and "male" language apart from source gender is associated with confidence. These slight directional differences can be interpreted only as trends, however.

Conclusions

This study shows that male and female communicators are differentially perceived. Additionally, a male speaker is perceived differently depending on the specific language features he uses and a female speaker is perceived differently depending on the specific language features she uses. Language characteristics and not source gender were the main determinants of differential perceptions in this study.

It can be concluded that rigid adherence to sex-based linguistic features is probably counterproductive to functional communication. If one's

purpose in a spontaneous dyadic conversation is to enhance one's credibility, one should probably use "female" language as defined here. If one wished to be perceived as extroverted, he/she should probably use "male" language as operationalized in this study. The more one can engage in situation-appropriate and goal-fulfilling communication and the less one is restricted by traditional sex-role prescriptions, the more flexibility and, consequently, the more communication competence is achieved. Situational flexibility or adaptability is linked to communication competence by several researchers.[40]

Research on sex differences in actual communication is still at a nascent state. Specifically, additional research on the gender variable in language is warranted. Communication researchers need to investigate the gender variable as it interacts with demographic, psychological, and situational variables. Perhaps the crucial question is what constitutes gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate communication. If communication competence is perceived, in part, as the ability to adapt one's communication across situations, then the terms gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate communication become meaningless and only serve to reinforce and perpetuate sex-role stereotypes.

Previous research has attempted to delineate differential features in the linguistic behavior of males and females. Perhaps it is time that we go beyond a mere cataloging of gender differences and investigate the antecedents and consequences of behavioral sex-role prescriptions. Researchers can investigate perceptual attributions to communicators who use communication styles traditionally associated the male or female gender. Such research may show that expectations of gender-appropriate communication behavior are giving way to the freedom for males and females to employ situationally appropriate communication behavior.

FOOTNOTES

[1] I. K. Broverman, S. R. Vogel, D. M. Broverman, F. E. Clarkson, and P. S. Rosenkrantz, "Sex Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal," Journal of Social Issues, 28 (1972), 59-78.

[2] D. N. Rubble and E. T. Higgins, "Effects of Group Sex Composition on Self-Presentation and Sex-Typing," Journal of Social Issues, 32 (1976), 125-132.

[3] Otto L. Jespersen, Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin (London: Allen and Unwin, 1922).

[4] Cheris Kramer, "Folklinguistics," Psychology Today, 8 (1974), 82-85.

[5] Cheris Kramer, "Female and Male Perceptions of Female and Male Speech," Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Sociological Association, 1975.

[6] See, for example: M. H. Landis and H. E. Burtt, "A Study of Conversation," Journal of Comparative Psychology, 4 (1924), 81-89.; C. Landis, "National Differences in Conversations," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 21 (1927), 354-375.; J. Klein, Samples from English Culture (London: Routledge and Paul, 1965).; Mirra Komarovsky, Blue-Collar Marriage (New York: Vintage, 1967).; Nancy F. Conklin, "Toward a Feminist Analysis of Linguistic Behavior," The University of Michigan Papers in Women's Studies, 1 (1974), 51-73.; Robin Lakoff, "You Are What You Say," Ms., 3 (1974), 63-67.

[7] See, for example: Robert F. Bales, Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1950).; T. Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process (New York: Free Press, 1955).; F. L. Strodtbeck and R. D. Mann, "Sex Role Differentiation in Jury Deliberations," Sociometry, 19 (1956), 3-11.; M. M. Wood, "The Influence of Sex and Knowledge of Communication

Effectiveness on Spontaneous Speech," Word, 22 (1966), 112-137.; Jessie Bernard, The Sex Game (New York: Atheneum, 1972).

8 John E. Baird, Jr., "Sex Differences in Group Communication: A Review of Relevant Research," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62 (1976), 179-192.

9 See, for example: R. W. Shuy, W. A. Wolfram, and W. K. Riley, "Linguistics Correlates of Social Stratification in Detroit Speech," In Nancy Henley and Barrie Thorne (eds), She Said/He Said: An Annotated Bibliography of Sex Differences in Language, Speech, and Nonverbal Communication (Pittsburg, Know, Inc., 1975).; J. L. Fisher, "Social Influence on the Choice of a Linguistic Variant," Word, 14 (1958), 47-56.; William Lavob, The Social Stratification of English in New York City (Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966).; L. Levine and H. J. Crockett, Jr., "Speech Variation in a Piedmont Community: Postvocalic 'r'," In S. Lieberman (ed.), Explorations in Sociolinguistics (Hague: Mouton, 1966), 76-98.; R. W. Fasold, A Sociolinguistic Study of the Pronunciation of Three Vowels in Detroit Speech (Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968).; R. W. Shuy, "Sex as a Factor in Sociolinguistic Research," Paper presented at Anthopological Society of Washington, 1969.; F. Anshen,"Speech Variation among Negroes in a Small Southern Community," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1969.; W. A. Wolfram, A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech (Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969).; William Labov, Sociolinguistic Patterns (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972).; Peter Trudgill, "Sex, Covert Prestige, and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich," Language in Society, 1 (1972), 179-195.

[10] Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley, "Difference and Dominance: An Overview of Language, Gender, and Society," In Thorne and Henley (eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance (Rowley, MA.: Newbury House, 1975).

[11] Pamela Fishman, "Interaction: The Work Women Do," Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, 1975.; Lynette Hirschman, "Male-Female Differences in Conversational Interaction," Paper presented at the Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, 1973.; W. F. Soskin and V. P. John, "The Study of Spontaneous Talk," In R. Barker (ed.), The Stream of Behavior (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963).

[12] Jessie Bernard, Academic Women (University Park, PA.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964).; Robin Lakoff, "Language and Women's Place," Language in Society 2 (1973), 45-79.

[13] Betty DuBois and Isabelle Crouch, "The Question of Tag-Questions in Women's Speech: They Don't Really Use More of Them, Do They?," Language in Society, 4 (1975), 289-294.

[14] Lakoff, 1973, 1974.

[15] Lakoff, 1973.

[16] Mary Ritchie Key, "Linguistic Behavior of Male and Female," Linguistics, 88 (1972), 15-31.; Connie C. Eble, "How the Speech of Some is More Equal Than Others," Paper presented at Southeastern Conference on Linguistics, 1972.; Lakoff, 1974.

[17] Strodtbeck and Mann, 1956.

[18] See, for example: M. Argyle, M. Laljee, and M. Cook, "The Effects of Visibility on Interaction in a Dyad," Human Relations, 21 (1968), 3-17.; J. Kester, mentioned in "In Other Words," Chicago Sun Times, 7 May 1972.; Don H. Zimmerman and Candice West, "Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversation," In Thorne and Henley, 1975.

[19] Lynette Hirschman, "Analysis of Supportive and Assertive Behavior in Conversations," Paper presented at the Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, 1974.

[20] See, for example: Argyle, Laljee, and Cook, 1968; Kester, 1972; and Zimmerman and West, 1975.

[21] See, for example: Jespersen, 1922; Lakoff, 1974; and Mario Pei, Words in Sheep's Clothing (New York: Hawthorne Books, 1969).

[22] Lakoff, 1973.

[23] See, for example: H. M. Gilley and C. S. Summers, "Sex Differences in the Use of Hostile Verbs," Journal of Psychology, 76 (1970), 33-37.; Nancy Barron, "Sex-Typed Language: The Production of Grammatical Cases," Acta Sociologica, 14 (1971), 24-42.

[24] Stuart Flexner, Preface to H. Wentworth and Stuart Flexner (eds.), Dictionary of American Slang (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1960).

[25] Kramer, 1974.

[26] Hirschman, 1973, 1974.

[27] M. D. Gall, A. K. Hobby, and K. H. Craik, "Non-Linguistic Factors in Oral Language Productivity," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 29 (1969), 871-874.; Winifred Brownell and Dennis R. Smith, "Communication Pattern, Sex, and Length of Verbalization in Speech of Four-Year-Old Children," Speech Monographs, 40 (1973), 310-316; Edward A. Mabry, "Female/Male Interaction in Unstructured Small Group Settings," Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association, 1976.

[28] F. L. Strodtbeck, "Husband-Wife Interaction over Revealed Differences," American Sociological Review, 16 (1951), 468-473.; Strodtbeck and Mann, 1956; M. Swacker, "The Sex of the Speaker as a Sociolinguistic Variable," In Thorne and Henley, 1975; W. F. Kenkel, "Observational Studies of Husband-Wife Interaction in Family Decision-Making," In M. Sussman (ed.), Sourcebook

in Marriage and the Family (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963), 144-156.; Soskin and John, 1963; Wood, 1966; Argyle, Laljee, and Cook, 1968; F. L. Strodtbeck, R. M. James, and C. Hawkins, "Social Status in Jury Deliberations," American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), 713-719.; Bernard, 1972; and A. M. Parker, "Sex Differences in Classroom Intellectual Argumentation," Unpublished masters thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1973.

29 G. Fairbanks, E. Herbert, and M. Hammond, "An Accoustical Study of Vocal Pitch in Seven- and Eight- Year Old Girls," Child Development, 20 (1949), 71-78.; G. Fairbanks, J. Wiley, and F. Lassman, "An Accoustical Study of Vocal Pitch in Seven- and Eight- Year Old Boys," Child Development, 20 (1949), 63-69.; J. C. Snedicor, "The Pitch and Duration Characteristics of Superior Female Speakers During Oral Reading," Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 16 (1951), 44-52.; J. Carrell and W. Tiffany, Phonetics: Theory and Application to Speech Inprovement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).; R. Duffy, "Fundamental Frequency Characteristics of Adolescent Females," Language and Speech, 13 (1970), 14-24.

30 M. M. Lewis, Infant Speech (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1936).; R. Weir, "Some Questions on the Child's Learning of Phonology," In Smith and Miller (eds.) The Genesis of Language (Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 1966).; L. Bloom, Language Development: Form and Function in Emerging Grammars (Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 1970).; R. Tonkova, "Development of Speech Intonation in Infants During the First Two Years of Life," In Ferguson and Slobin (eds.) Studies of Child Language Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973).; W. Von Raffler Engle, "The Development from Sound to Phoneme in Children's Language," In Ferguson and Slobin, 1973.

[31] J. C. Snedicor, "Studies in the Pitch and Duration Characteristics of Superior Speakers," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1940.; Snedicor, 1951; Ruth M. Brend, "Male-Female Intonation Patterns in American English," Proceedings of the 7th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 1971 (Hague: Mouton, 1972).; Lakoff, 1973; S. M. Ginet, "Linguistic Behavior and the Double Standard," Paper presented at the Conference on Intercultural Communication, 1974.; Mary Ritchie Key, Male/Female Language (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975.; Doris M. Richards, "A Comparative Study of the Intonation Characteristics of Young Adult Males and Females," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1975.

[32] I. K. Broverman, D. H. Broverman, F. E. Clarkson, P. Rosenkrantz, and S. R. Vogel, "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Clinical Judgments of Mental Health," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 34 (1970), 1-7. Broverman, et al., 1972; D. M. Connell and J. E. Johnson, "Relationship Between Sex-Role Identification and Self-Esteem in Early Adolescents," Developmental Psychology, 3 (1970), 268.; J. P. Gump, "Sex-Role Attitudes and Psychological Well-Being," Journal of Social Issues, 28 (1972), 79-92.; P. W. Lunneborg, "Stereotypic Aspects in Masculinity-Femininity Measurement," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34 (1970), 113-118.; P. S. Rosenkrantz, S. R. Vogel, H. Bee, I. K. Broverman, and D. M. Broverman, "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Self-Concepts in College Students," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32 (1968), 387-395.; S. R. Vogel, I. K. Broverman, D. M. Broverman, F. E. Clarkson, and P. S. Rosenkrantz, "Maternal Employment and Perception of Sex-Roles among College Students," Developmental Psychology, 3 (1970), 384-391.

[33] P. Roget, The Original Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965).

[34] Raymond K. Tucker and Lawrence J. Chase, "Factor Analysis in Human Communication Research," Paper presented at the International Communication Association, 1975.

[35] D. J. Armor, "Theta Reliability and Factor Scaling," In H. L. Costner (ed.) Sociological Methodology (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1974).

[36] Jerome Finn, Multivariance (Chicago: National Education Resources, Inc., 1972).

[37] Ned A. Shearer (ed.), Bibliographic Annual in Speech Communication (New York: Speech Communication Association, 1971).

[38] T. J. Housel and P. J. McDermott, "The Perceived Credibility and Persuasiveness of a Message Source as Affected by Initial Credibility, Style of Language, and Sex of Source," Paper presented at the International Communication Association, 1976.

[39] Baird, 1976; Key, 1975; and J. Kagan, "Check One: Male, Female," Psychology Today, 3 (1969), 39-41.

[40] Arthur P. Bochner and Clifford W. Kelly, "Interpersonal Competence: Rationale, Philosophy, and Implementation of a Conceptual Framework," Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 279-301.; P. C. Feingold, "Toward a Paradigm of Effective Communication: An Empirical Study of Perceived Communication Effectiveness," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1976.; J. M. Wiemann, "Explication and Text of a Model of Communication Competence," Human Communication Research, 3 (1977), 195-213.

Table 1

Cell Means for Male and Female Speakers in Gender-Appropriate Language Condition (pilot Study)

Variable	Male Speaker	Female Speaker
1. task orientation	4.07	3.90
2. socio-emotional orientation	5.23	3.17
3. -in (incorrect) pronunciation	4.30	3.53
4. interruption	2.03	6.13
5. talkativeness	5.30	4.63
6. high pitch	5.23	3.60
7. expressive intonation	5.83	3.40

On variables 3 and 5, the higher mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait; on varaibles 1,2,4,6,and 7, the lower mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait

Table 2

Cell Means for Male and Female Speakers in Gender-Inappropriate Language Condition (pilot study)

Variable	Male Speaker	Female Speaker
1. task orientation	3.90	3.30
2. socio-emotional orientation	3.57	4.27
3. -in (incorrect) pronunciation	2.53	5.23
4. interruption	6.60	1.27
5. talkativeness	4.13	5.90
6. high pitch	4.07	5.03
7. expressive intonation	2.93	4.83

On varaibles 3 and 5, the higher mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait; on variables 1,2,4,6, and 7, the lower mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait

Table 3

Dependent Measure Factor Loadings

Item	Credibility	Extroversion	Activity	Confidence
1. unreasonable/ reasonable	.78	-.21	.29	.06
2. logical/illogical	.77	.01	.14	.11
3. unsound/sound	.76	.10	.08	.02
4. incorrect/correct	-.75	.10	-.03	-.09
5. disorganized/ organized	-.74	-.03	-.05	.02
6. uncontrolled/ controlled	.73	.04	.01	-.00
7. meaningful/ meaningless	.73	.03	.17	-.08
8. high class/ low class	-.73	-.07	.01	.02
9. precise/imprecise	-.72	-.20	.06	.03
10. disoriented/ oriented	-.72	-.11	-.14	-.11
11. practical/ impractical	-.71	.10	-.15	-.05
12. confused/orderly	-.70	-.02	-.07	-.12
13. responsible/ irresponsible	-.70	.23	-.19	-.07
14. unstructured/ structured	-.69	,05	.02	.06
15. inappropriate/ appropriate	.68	-.16	.12	.06
16. relevant/irrelevant	-.67	.22	-.12	-.24

Table 3: Continued

Item	Credibility	Extroversion	Activity	Confidence
17. wrong/right	.66	-.05	.09	.05
18. exact/inexact	-.66	-.16	.10	.12
19. unresponsive/ responsive	-.64	.30	-.24	-.24
20. pure/impure	.63	.01	.13	-.18
21. extroverted/ introverted	.02	.81	-.01	.20
22. bashful/bold	-.31	.73	-.12	.07
23. aggressive/ nonaggressive	.28	-.78	.14	-.05
24. retiring/forward	.25	-.77	.09	-.10
25. follower/leader	-.27	.77	-.26	.04
26. assertive/ non-assertive	.10	-.76	.02	-.06
27. passive/active	.02	-.76	-.07	-.07
28. outgoing/shy	-.00	.75	.09	.06
29. unsure/sure	.21	.69	.02	.09
30. superior/ subordinate	.26	-.68	.36	-.04
31. soft/loud	.14	-.67	-.20	.03
32. independent/ dependent	-.01	-.58	.13	-.09
33. idle/busy	.13	.57	.22	.02
34. persuasive/ unpersuasive	.21	-.51	.01	-.17
35. small/large	.12	.47	.00	-.16
36. dynamic/static	-.36	-.38	-.42	.03

Table 3: Continued

Item	Credibility	Extroversion	Activity	Confidence
37. subdued/lively	-.30	-.47	-.51	-.10
38. alive/dead	.44	.34	.53	.09
39. nonemotional/ emotional	.39	-.13	.56	.04
40. ill at ease/ at ease	-.22	-.48	-.03	-.55
41. relaxed/tense	.15	.26	.09	.76
42. nervous/calm	.12	.39	-.10	.63
43. loose/tight	-.13	.38	.34	.41

Table 4

Cell Means for Male and Female Speakers
in Gender-Appropriate Language Condition

Factor	Male Speaker	Female Speaker
1. credibility	4.53	3.16
2. extroversion	3.45	4.58
3. activity	4.35	4.08
4. confidence	4.35	3.70

On all factors, the lower mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait

Table 5

Cell Means for Male and Female Speakers
in Gender-Inappropriate Language Condition

Factor	Male Speaker	Female Speaker
1. credibility	3.41	4.91
2. extroversion	4.79	2.61
3. activity	4.24	4.00
4. confidence	4.34	3.48

On all factors the lower mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait

Table 6

Cell Means for the Male Speaker in the Gender-Appropriate and Gender-Inappropriate Language Conditions

Factor	Appropriate Male Speaker	Inappropriate Male Speaker
1. credibility	4.53	3.41
2. extroversion	3.45	4.79
3. activity	4.35	4.24
4. confidence	4.34	4.34

On all factors the lower mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait

Table 7

Cell Means for the Female Speaker in the Gender-Appropriate and Gender-Inappropriate Language Conditions

Factor	Appropriate Female Speaker	Inappropriate Female Speaker
1. credibility	3.16	4.91
2. extroversion	4.58	2.61
3. activity	4.08	4.00
4. confidence	3.70	3.48

On all factors the lower mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait